

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 3, 2003 has been carefully studied. The claims in the case are now 1-24. Claims 3 and 4 are allowed and claims 10, 11, 14 and 16 would be allowable subject to removal of claim objections or rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

The following paragraphs correspond to the order of the paragraphs of the Office Action:

The specification on page 9, line 29 is now corrected by eliminating the reference "US-A-626,396". Inasmuch as this reference is merely one of several references which are included to teach the processes for synthesizing polyvinylidene fluoride, (PVDF), this reference is unnecessary.

In claim 6, the word "advantageously" is stricken.

In claim 19, the Examiner's suggestion is adopted so the clause reads "wherein the tube comprises a coated metal surface in accordance with claim 18".

Claims 12 and 14 are amended by including the chemical name prior to the acronyms "PVDF" and "VF2-HFP". The polymers in question are polyvinylidene fluoride and a copolymer of vinylidene fluoride and hexafluoropropylene.

With respect to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, it is seen that claim 10 is amended so as to remove any reference to "oil". Conversely, claim 20 is not dependent on claim 1, but instead is dependent on claim 19 which contains antecedent support for "oil".

Rejections Over The Prior Art

The prior art is no longer relevant to the instant claims because a requirement of the instant claims is the presence of a blend comprising a fluoropolymer and a fluoropolymer chemically modified by partial dehydrofluorination. Neither the Carson nor the Barriere et al. disclose or suggest such a blend. The Examiner on page 7 of the Office Action confirms this analysis. The Examiner has also indicated the reasons for the allowability of claims 3 and 4.

Newly Added Claims

The newly added claims mirror claim 12 but with different dependencies.


Finally, for the record, the Office Action contains a clerical error on line 5 of the middle

paragraph of page 3. The pertinent part of the reference is not column 9, lines 9-16, but rather column 8, lines 9-16.

In view of this amendment, it appears that the application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues which can be expeditiously resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone Counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,


I. William Millen, Reg. No. 19,544
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: ATOCM-254

Date: January 2, 2004
IWM:pdK:\Atocm\200-299\254\REPLY.doc